nothing to be exempted from the power of God Ibut only this, that he cannot make that not to have been, which hath been; that is, do what implies a contradiction.

Uovcv ya,% au-roy, *xcti* @EOC <TT£ptcrx£Ta(, 4.
'Ayiwra, Troteiv, etcnr* *otv* ? *ififf^cvyfAiva,'*

Eth. Nic. I. [c]- 2. p. 98. torn, iii. oper.

Hoc namqi*e duutaxat negatum etiam Deo est, Quae facia sunt, infecta posse reddere.

Lastly, that the Atheists themselves under Paganism looked upon omnipotence and infinite power as an essential attribute of the Deity, appears plainly from Lucretius; when he tells us, that Epicurus, in order to the taking away of religion, set himself to confute infinite power:

----Omne immeosum peragravit mente animoque,
j^ i. rers,
TJnde refert.nobis victor, quid possit oriri, 75, &c.
QwM nequeat: finita potestas denique
quoique Quanam sit ratione, atque alte
terminus haerens. Quare religio pedibus
subjecta vicissira Obteritur, nos
exaequat victoria coelo.

As if he should have said, Epicurus, by shewing that all power was finite, effectually destroyed religion: he thereby taking away the object of it, which is an omnipotent and infinitely powerful Deity. And this is a thing, which the same poet bft^n harps upon again, that there is no infinite power, and consequently no Deity, according to the,true idea of it. But, last of all, in his $ixth book, he condemns religionists, as guilty of great folly, in asserting omnipotence or infinite power (that is, a Deity), after this manner:

R«rsus in antiquas referuntur
religiones, Et dominos acres
asciscunt, omnia posse, Quos miseri
credunt, ignari quid queat esse,.